

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Acting United States Attorney

DAVID R. CALLAWAY (CABN 121782)
Chief, Criminal Division

ANDREW F. DAWSON (CABN 264421)
Assistant United States Attorney
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102-3495
Telephone: (415) 436-7019
FAX: (415) 436-7234
Andrew.Dawson@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CASE NO: CR 16-062 EMC
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE, EXCLUDE TIME,
)	AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
v.)	
)	
JOSE RIGOBERTO YEPEZ)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

The parties are currently set for a status conference on March 30, 2016, at 2:30 p.m. The government has provided discovery to the defense, which is reviewing it. Counsel for the United States currently has trial in another matter set to begin April 4, 2016, with the pretrial conference set for March 30, 2016, at 2:00pm. In light of the conflict between that pretrial conference and the status conference in this matter, the parties request that the hearing on March 30, 2016 be continued three weeks, to April 20, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., and that the time between March 30, 2016 and April 20, 2016, be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B). Excluding time until April 20, 2016, will allow for the effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

//

//

//

STIPULATION TO CONTINUE, EXCLUDE TIME, AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
CR 16-062 EC

1 IT IS SO STIPULATED.
2

3 DATED: March 29, 2016

/s/

ANDREW F. DAWSON
Assistant United States Attorney

5 DATED: March 29, 2016

/s/

DANIEL BLANK
Counsel for Defendant Jose Rigoberto Yepez

[~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER

The status conference set for March 30, 2016, at 2:30 p.m. is continued to April 20, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. The Court finds that the exclusion of the period from March 30, 2016 to April 20, 2016 from the time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161, is warranted; that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in the prompt disposition of this criminal case; and that the failure to grant the requested exclusion of time would deny counsel for the defendant and for the government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 3/29/16

